

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-26 and 28-38 are pending. Claims 1, 15 and 22 have been amended. Claims 2-4, 7, 9-14, 16-21, 23-26 and 30-35 are original. Claims 6, 8, 28-29 and 36-38 are previously presented. Claims 5 and 27 are cancelled. No new matter has been introduced by the amendment.

1. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 6-15, 18-26 and 28-38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Abileah (U.S. Pat. No. 5,262,880) in view of An et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,392,724). Claims 17 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Abileah in view of An and in further view of Kanatsu et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,867,825). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections based on the following remarks.

The Examiner has conceded that Abileah fails to explicitly disclose a unitary case supporting the plurality of fluorescent lamps, the heat protecting plate and the reflecting plate, wherein the heat protection plate is disposed in the case. The Examiner tries to overcome this deficiency by asserting that An teaches a case supporting the light source elements in which a heat protecting plate is disposed in the case (Office Action, page 3). An, however, discloses an LCD module with an edge-type backlight, that is, the fixing structure 170 disclosed in An supports lamps 144 at an edge of the LCD module (see column 5, lines 31-33).

In contrast, the LCD device having a direct-type backlight recited in amended independent claims 1, 15 and 22 comprises a unitary case supporting the plurality of fluorescent lamps disposed below the LCD panel at fixed intervals in the area substantially corresponding to the LCD panel. Support for the amended independent

Application No. 10/721,735
Amendment dated August 25, 2006
In Response to non-final Office Action mailed May 25, 2006
Page 12 of 12

claims 1, 15 and 22 can be found in the Applicant's specification, for example, in paragraph 46, lines 5-7, and in Figures 3, 4 and 5.


In view of the above remarks and amendments, the Applicant respectfully submits that Abileah in view of An does not teach or suggest all the limitations as recited in independent claims 1, 15 and 22, and thus a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established (see MPEP 2143). Accordingly, the rejections against independent claims 1, 15 and 22, and thus the rejections against claims 2-4, 6-14, 16-21, 23-26 and 28-38, which all depend from independent claims 1, 15 and 22, have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

2. Conclusion

Based on the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. The examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 25, 2006


Gustavo Siller, Jr.
Registration No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610
(312) 321-4200